REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 27 and 28 have been amended.

Applicants are submitting herewith a duplicate copy of the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 22, 2000, including a copy of references cited.

The drawings filed December 22, 2000 were objected to by the Examiner. Applicants are enclosing herewith a duplicate of the Petition to Substitute Drawings for Publication (including substitute drawings) mailed March 28, 2001. Applicants believe that the substitute drawings overcome the Examiner's objections.

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-15, 17-18, 26-28 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Mainwaring et al. Although the Examiner provided a copy of the PCT published application, Mainwaring et al. issued as US patent 6,351,271. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mainwaring in view of Sheth. Claims 8, 16, 19, 21 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mainwaring in view of Lang et al. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mainwaring in view of King et al. Claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mainwaring in view of Knight et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1, as it is presently amended, is directed to an electronic board system, comprising: an electronic board including a screen for displaying information items of interest in different areas of the screen; apparatus for sensing which areas of the screen are of current interest to users viewing the screen; an input device for receiving information items to be displayed on the electronic board from a plurality of users; a memory for storing information items received from the input device; and a processor for selecting which information items from the input device and the memory to display on the screen, for determining where and how to display the selected information items on the screen and for displaying the selected information items in the different areas on the screen; wherein the processor dynamically selects which information items to display on the screen in accordance with a predetermined relationship based on group-based recommendation criteria and reactively selects which information items to display on the screen

in accordance with sensed user interest as determined by the sensing apparatus, wherein, in response to user interest as determined by the sensing apparatus, the processor displays more items on the screen that are similar to items in the sensed areas at the expense of items in areas in which there is less user interest.

The electronic board system as claimed in Claim 1 is reactive in that it sense the areas of the screen that users are currently interested in and devotes more display space to those areas at the expense of areas in which there is less interest. For example, if the electronic board system display has three main areas: one area devoted to social activities, another area devoted to movie reviews and another area devoted to music reviews, and the sensing apparatus senses that a group of users is interested in music reviews, the electronic board system will readjust the display areas so that more area (and hence more items) is devoted to music reviews and less area (and hence fewer items) is devoted to social activities and movie reviews.

Nothing in Mainwaring et al. teaches or suggests an electronic board system as claimed in Claim 1. Mainwaring et al. teaches a method and apparatus for semi-synchronous communication within a shared persistent space. Mainwaring et al. is concerned with the problem of providing access to a shared persistent space, i.e., a space where information items are persistent. In Mainwaring et al. a server maintains at least one group database thereby creating a shared persistent space accessible by the IDUs (input/display units). See col. 3, lines 34-35. One IDU may be in the form of a display screen 100 (Fig. 4) on which users may input information items using a variety of input devices. In Mainwaring et al.' system users must request which items to be displayed on a particular IDS. This can be accomplished by tokens 124. The user may use the tokens 124 to request and display data from the storage units 116. After examining the transmitted data, the user may then make modifications using one of the input devices 120 (col. 5, lines 33-36).

Mainwaring et al. is not dynamic in that items displayed on an IDU are displayed entirely at a user's request. In contrast, in Applicants' Claim 1, "the processor dynamically selects which information items to display on the screen in accordance with a predetermined relationship based on group-based recommendation criteria". In Applicants' Claim 1, the processor also "reactively selects which information items to display on the screen in accordance with sensed user interest

Application No. 09/746,914

as determined by the sensing apparatus, wherein, in response to user interest as determined by the sensing apparatus, the processor displays more items on the screen that are similar to items in the sensed areas at the expense of items in areas in which there is less user interest." There is no sensing apparatus in Mainwaring et al.; Mainwaring et al. only teaches a direct user input device (the IDUs).

Information items in Mainwaring et al. are persistent; they are not deleted or removed except by user action or user notification. See col. 7, lines 34-44. In contrast, in Applicants' invention as claimed in Claim 1, the system dynamically and reactively revises the display of information items. Items may be removed by the system independent of direct user action. Items may be removed if there is insufficient room to keep them on the display, in light of increased user interest in other items.

Nothing in Sheth, Lang et al., King et al., or Knight, whether taken alone or in combination with Mainwaring et al. teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed in Claim 1. Nothing in Sheth, Lang et al., King et al., or Knight overcome the lack of teachings of Mainwaring et al.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment, however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned Attorney for Applicants, Jeannette M. Walder.

Respectfully submitted,

Xerox Corporation El Segundo, CA 90245

Date: September 19, 2003

Jeannette M. Walder Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 30,698

Telephone: (310) 333-3660

enc: Duplicate IDS with 4 references

Duplicate of Petition to Substitute Drawings for Publication mailed March 28, 2001

U.S. Patent No. 6,351,271

not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.